

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GEORGE WILLIAM VETTER,
Plaintiff,
v.
CDCR, *et al.*,
Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-cv-02241-JDP (PC)

ORDER

On March 6, 2023, I screened plaintiff's first amended complaint and notified him that his claims were not cognizable under § 1983. ECF No. 10. I granted him thirty days to file an amended complaint or advisement indicating his intent to stand by his current complaint, subject to a recommendation that it be dismissed. *Id.* I also warned him that failure to comply with the March 6 order could result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. *Id.* at 3.

On April 5, 2023, plaintiff filed objections to the March 6 order. Those objections have not persuaded me to change my view regarding appropriate screening of plaintiff's complaint. Although plaintiff might have intended to inform me through those objections that he wishes to stand by his current complaint—"Plaintiff requests for this Court to allow him to proceed with a COMPLAINT FOR 'DECLARATORY' RELIEF AND DAMAGES, as stated in the 1st Amended Complaint"—I cannot definitively say that that is his intent.

Therefore, plaintiff is directed to file an amended complaint or statement that indicates

1 with sufficient clarity that he wishes to stand by his complaint, subject to dismissal. Plaintiff's
2 failure to respond to this order will constitute a failure to comply with a court order and will result
3 in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Should plaintiff wish to continue with this
4 lawsuit, he shall file, within twenty-one days, an amended complaint or advisement of his intent
5 to stand by his current complaint.

6
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.
8

9 Dated: May 16, 2023
10


11 JEREMY D. PETERSON
12 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28